



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CORRESPONDENCE.

I wish to call attention very briefly to the nature of three or four of Professor Knapp's criticisms of my *Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome*, in his review of the book in the last number of this Journal, pp. 213 ff.

Professor Knapp says: "On page 138 the altar of Aius Locutius is said to stand 'On the *northwest*¹ slope of the (Palatine) hill'; on page 139 we read 'There are on that part of the hill which lies between the domus Augustana, the domus Tiberiana, and the *southwest* edge (of the hill) the remains of two temples'. These statements, on successive pages, refer to precisely the same part of the Palatine". Not precisely. The first statement refers to the point at the southern end of the northwest slope of the hill, where the altar stands. The second statement refers to the area on the hill which is bounded by the domus Augustana, the domus Tiberiana, the southwest edge, and the northwest edge of the hill, and in defining this area three of these four sides are mentioned, the southwest rather than the northwest because of its greater length and its relation to the two temples.

Professor Knapp says: "On page 214 the author says: 'Caesar *decided to remove* the Rostra to the Forum, but his definite plan seems not to have been carried out until after 42 B. C. Thenceforth the Rostra of the empire was a long platform extending across the *west* end of the Forum'. Now, on page 179 we have already read that 'Julius Caesar *erected* a second platform, the rostra Iulia, at the *east* end of the Forum, in front of the Regia', etc." My critic does not seem to know that there were two rostra in imperial times, according to the theory of the *rostra Iulia* that I accept, and that the statements quoted refer to these two different structures.

Professor Knapp says: "On page 373 the pons Sublicius is described, in passing, as 'later pons Aemilius'. On page 80 the author says of the pons Sublicius: 'The strongest evidence seems to indicate a point between the porta Trigemina and the ruined ponte Rotto, and very probably close to the latter'. On this same page (80) a paragraph is headed, 'Pons Aemilius, perhaps the ruined ponte Rotto'!"

The pons Sublicius is not "described, in passing, as 'later pons Aemilius' ". These three words stand in a parenthesis (p. 373), and are not intended to mean what the reviewer says they do, but that the road, which first ran to the pons Sublicius,

¹ The italics are Professor Knapp's.

afterwards ran to the pons Aemilius, as most of the traffic was probably diverted to that bridge. Perhaps any possible ambiguity ought to have been avoided, but after reading the careful discussion of the bridges in chapter V, some of the statements of which he quotes in this very connection, the reviewer should have known that the parenthesis on page 373 could not mean what he says it does.

Professor Knapp says: "On page 137 we have a brief discussion of the temple on the Palatine which in recent times has been generally regarded as that of the Magna Mater. It closes thus: 'Inscriptions relating to the Magna Mater, a portion of a colossal female figure—undoubtedly the goddess—seated on a throne, and a fragment of a base with the paws of lions, the regular attendants of Cybele, have been found near the podium of this temple'. From all this one would naturally infer that the author believed the temple to be that of the Magna Mater".

My words are quoted incorrectly. What is actually said (at the end of the sentence quoted above) is this—"have been found near the podium of the temple marked C on the plan of the Palatine". A careful reading of this passage would have shown my critic that the language was intentionally chosen to guard against any such definite identification as he assumes at this point, and to leave the whole matter open for the discussion on pp. 139, 140.

Professor Knapp says: "Again, cross-references are lacking often" (the index is apparently overlooked) "where their insertion would have been most helpful, even to the author himself in forcing him to correlate his statements at various places in the book. Thus, on page 74 the Septizonium is called 'a seven-zoned structure'. There is nothing to explain this till we reach page 156".

Why should there be? The first is a passing reference, the second the detailed description of the building in its proper place.

Professor Knapp continues: "On page 17 it is stated that the accumulation of the fragments heaped together in monte Testaccio began as early as the last century of the Republic; on page 399 we read 'it is certain that the dumping of debris on this spot began as early as the time of Augustus'".

Here again my critic has read carelessly and omitted an important word in his citation. On page 17 it is stated that the accumulation doubtless began as early as the last century of the republic, while on page 399 it is said that it is certain that it began as early as the time of Augustus. Doubtless, in ordinary usage, indicates a high degree of probability, and I wrote the sentence in this form at this place in order to express my own opinion that probably the process did begin somewhat earlier than the time of Augustus. On page 399 I wish to state only what is certain. The difference in the statements, and the reason for it, ought to be sufficiently plain.

Through the courtesy of the Editor of the Journal I have been permitted to see Professor Platner's remarks on my review of his *Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome*. It is with great reluctance that I reply, because I am convinced that controversies of this sort are generally valueless. Yet, lest silence on my part be construed as a plea of guilty on the counts in the indictment drawn by Professor Platner, I shall reply briefly, and, so far as I am concerned, finally.

Professor Platner seeks to throw doubts on my carefulness. This compels me to be more personal than I would otherwise be, in explaining how the review was written. I first heard of Mr. Platner's book in Rome, in July, 1904. A book such as this professes to be as precisely what I wanted at that time. I secured a copy and read it through. I then carried it about with me among the ruins day by day, reading it through again in this way in detail, not merely once but several times, as I studied the individual monuments. I then wrote out a very lengthy review of the book, which I compared with the monuments on the spot, reading the portions affected over and over. The condensed form finally printed was itself written out twice. Ignorant I may be, but careless surely not.

So much for a general reply. I note that Professor Platner picks out but five or six points of the many raised in the review, all of them, too, points of minor consequence. On page 139 Mr. Platner says: "There are on that part of the hill which lies between the domus Augustana, the domus Tiberiana, and the southwest edge two temples". I remember puzzling over this sentence and examining it in connection with the diagram of the Palatine given in Figure 16. The temples under discussion are there marked C and F. Inasmuch as between C and that part of the hill which Mr. Platner in his present commentary on his book describes as "the southwest edge" considerable ruins lie, I decided finally that by "the southwest edge" Mr. Platner meant the stretch of the hill along the Velabrum, at whose terminating point stands the altar which he describes on page 138. In the light of the conclusion thus laboriously reached I wrote the passage in the review. Mr. Platner has now supplied a commentary on his language. I *can* see how his words *may* be interpreted as he assures us they ought to be interpreted. I can only say that his description of the location of these temples, as he has now interpreted it, is faulty. Why mention at all the edge which he now defines as the southwest edge? Why omit the edge along the Velabrum? Why go from the east side to the north side and then to the south side, omitting the west side entirely? Why not give as the southern boundary the structures commonly known as the *Scalae Caci*? On this same page, I note now, in describing temple F in detail, Mr. Platner gives the *Scalae Caci* as one of its boundaries.

On page 373, the following words are to be read: "The forum Boarium was originally the open meadow where cattle were

bought and sold, extending from the Velabrum to the Tiber, and from the valley of the Circus Maximus on the east to a line which was approximately indicated by the road leading from the pons Sublicius (later pons Aemilius) to the Velabrum". I dared to say that Mr. Platner here described, in passing, the pons Sublicius as later the pons Aemilius. He now tells us that he meant "that the road, which first ran to the pons Sublicius, afterwards ran to the pons Aemilius, as most of the traffic was probably diverted to that bridge". I submit that no person with the usual training in language would dream of interpreting Mr. Platner's words as he would have us understand them.

Lastly, let us come to the Monte Testaccio matter. Mr. Platner himself confesses that on pages 17 and 399 he has given two distinct views concerning the matter under discussion, thus fully confirming the contention in my review.

It is evident from the little I have allowed myself to say that Mr. Platner's views of the meaning, interpretation and use of English words are widely different from mine. I hold that it is a writer's first business to be absolutely clear. He has no right to reserve to himself part of the meaning of his words, or to set up canons of interpretation of his language which are not universally recognized. It is clear also that Mr. Platner's theories of bookmaking are different from mine. I maintain that a writer should use all possible diligence in coming to reasoned conclusions, and that he should be at harmony with himself in different parts of his book. Consistency has, I know, been characterized as the vice of fools, but surely in a manual of topography meant, as this book was evidently meant, for the widest possible audience, and not merely for those who out of extensive acquaintance with other manuals or first-hand knowledge of the monuments themselves could supply that commentary which Mr. Platner has so generously furnished now to me on one or two points, in a manual of this sort, I say, consistency would be a decided merit, and any lack of clearness is a decided blemish.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
October 2, 1905.

CHARLES KNAPP.